

4.13 WASTE MANAGEMENT IMPACTS

Solid waste generated at the NEF will be disposed of at licensed facilities designed to accept the various waste types. Industrial waste, including miscellaneous trash, filters, resins and paper will be shipped offsite for compaction and then sent to a licensed waste landfill. Radioactive waste will be collected in labeled containers in each Restricted Area and transferred to the Solid Waste Collection Room for inspection. Suitable waste will be volume-reduced and all radioactive waste disposed of at a licensed LLW disposal facility. Hazardous and some mixed wastes will be collected at the point of generation, transferred to the Solid Waste Collection Room, inspected, and classified. Any mixed waste that may be processed to meet land disposal requirements may be treated in its original collection container and shipped as LLW for disposal. There will be no onsite disposal of solid waste at the NEF. Waste Management Impacts for onsite disposal, therefore, need not be evaluated. Onsite storage of UBCs will minimally impact the environment. A detailed pathway assessment for the UBC Storage Pad is provided in ER Section 4.13.3.1.1, UBC Storage.

NEF will generate approximately 1,770 kg (3,932 lbs) of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous wastes per year and 50 kg (110 lbs) of mixed waste. This is an average of 147 kg (325 lbs) per month. Under New Mexico regulations, a facility that generates less than 100 kg (220 lbs) per month is conditionally exempt. In New Mexico, hazardous waste generators are classified by the actual monthly generation rate, not the annual average. Given that the average is over 100 kg/mo (220 lbs/mo), NEF would be considered a small quantity generator and would not be conditionally exempt from the New Mexico Hazardous Waste Bureau (NMHWB) hazardous waste regulations. Within 90 days after the generation of any new waste stream, NEF will need to determine if it is classified as a hazardous waste. If so, the NEF will need to notify the NMHWB within that time period. As a small quantity generator, the NEF will be required to file an annual report to the NMHWB and to pay an annual fee. The NEF plans to ship all hazardous wastes offsite within the allowed timeframe, therefore, no further permitting should be necessary. Without the appropriate RCRA permit, NEF will not treat, store or dispose of hazardous wastes onsite; therefore the impacts for such systems need not be evaluated.

4.13.1 Waste Descriptions

Descriptions of the sources, types and quantities of solid, hazardous, radioactive and mixed wastes generated by NEF construction and operation are provided in ER Section 3.12, Waste Management.

4.13.2 Waste Management System Description

Descriptions of the proposed NEF waste management systems are provided in ER Section 3.12.

4.13.3 Waste Disposal Plans

4.13.3.1 Radioactive and Mixed Waste Disposal Plans

Solid radioactive wastes are produced in a number of plant activities and require a variety of methods for treatment and disposal. These wastes, as well as the generation and handling systems, are described in detail in ER Section 3.12, Waste Management.

All radioactive and mixed wastes will be disposed of at offsite, licensed facilities. The impacts on the environment due to these offsite facilities are not addressed in this report. Table 4.13-1, Possible Radioactive Waste Processing/Disposal Facilities, summarizes the facilities that may be used to process or dispose of NEF radioactive or mixed waste.

Radioactive waste will be shipped to any of the three listed radioactive waste processing / disposal sites. Other offsite processing or disposal facilities may be used if appropriately licensed to accept NEF waste types. Depleted UF_6 will most likely be shipped to one of the UF_6 Conversion Facilities subsequent to temporary onsite storage. The remaining mixed waste will either be pretreated in its collection container onsite prior to offsite disposal, or shipped directly to a mixed waste processor for ultimate disposal.

The Barnwell site, located in Barnwell, South Carolina, is a low-level radioactive waste disposal facility licensed in an agreement state in association with 10 CFR 61, (CFR, 2003r). This facility is licensed to accept NEF low-level waste either directly from the NEF site or as processed waste from offsite waste processing vendors. The disposal site is approximately 2,320 km (1,441 mi) from the NEF.

The Clive site, located in South Clive, Utah, is owned and operated privately by Envirocare of Utah. This low-level waste disposal site is also licensed in an agreement state in association with 10 CFR 61 (CFR, 2003r), and 40 CFR 264 (CFR, 2003v). Currently, the license allows acceptance of Class A waste only. In addition to accepting radioactive waste, the Clive facility may accept some mixed wastes. This facility is licensed to accept NEF low-level waste either directly from the NEF site or as processed waste from offsite waste processing vendors. The disposal site is approximately 1,636 km (1,016 mi) from the NEF.

Waste processors such as GTS Duratek, primarily located in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, have the ability to volume reduce most Class A low level wastes. GTS Duratek also has the capability to process contaminated oils and some mixed wastes. The NEF may send wastes that are candidates for volume reduction, recycling, or treatment to the GTS Duratek facilities. Other processing vendors may be used to process NEF waste depending on future availability. The processing facilities are approximately 1,993 km (1,238 mi).

With regard to depleted UF_6 disposal, DOE has recently contracted for the construction and operation of depleted UF_6 conversion facilities in Paducah, Kentucky, and Portsmouth, Ohio. This action was taken following the earlier enactment of Section 3113 of the USEC Privatization Act, which requires the Secretary of Energy to "accept" for disposal depleted UF_6 generated by an NRC-licensed facility such as the NEF, and related subsequent legislation. DOE facilities for conversion and ultimate offsite disposal of LES generated depleted UF_6 is one of the options available for the disposition of depleted UF_6 . Such disposal will be accomplished either by sale of converted depleted UF_6 for reuse or by shipment of the depleted UF_6 to a licensed disposal

facility for burial. As described later in this chapter, other options are available for depleted UF_6 disposal. The environmental impact of a UF_6 conversion facility was previously evaluated generically for the Claiborne Enrichment Center (CEC) and is documented in Section 4.2.2.8 of the NRC Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) (NRC, 1994a). After scaling to account for the increased capacity of the NEF compared to the CEC, this evaluation remains valid for NEF. In addition, the Department of Energy has recently issued FEISs (DOE, 2004a; DOE, 2004b) for the UF_6 conversion facilities to be constructed and operated at Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH. These FEISs consider the construction, operation, maintenance, and decontamination and decommissioning of the conversion facilities and are also valid evaluations for the NEF.

4.13.3.1.1 Uranium Byproduct Cylinder (UBC) Storage

The NEF yields a depleted UF_6 stream that will be temporarily stored onsite in containers before transfer to the conversion facility and subsequent reuse or disposal. The storage containers are referred to as Uranium Byproduct Cylinders (UBC). The storage location is designated the UBC Storage Pad. The UBC Storage Pad will have minimal environmental impacts.

The NEF's preferred option for disposition of the UBCs includes temporary onsite storage of cylinders. See ER Section 4.13.3.1.3. There will be no disposal onsite. The NEF will pursue economically viable disposal paths for the UBCs as soon as they become available. In addition, the NEF will look to private deconversion facilities to render the UF_6 into U_3O_8 .

LES is committed to the following storage and disposition of UBCs on the NEF site (LES, 2003b):

- Only temporary onsite storage will be utilized.
- No long-term storage beyond the life of the plant.
- Aggressively pursue economically viable disposal paths.
- Setting up a financial surety bonding mechanism to assure adequate funding is in place to dispose of all UBCs.

Since UBCs will be stored for a time on the pad, the potential impact of this preferred option is the remote possibility of stormwater runoff from the UBC Storage Pad becoming contaminated with UF_6 or its derivatives. Cylinders placed on the UBC Storage Pad normally have no surface contamination due to restrictions placed on surface contamination levels by plant operating procedures. Because of the remote possibility of contamination, the runoff water will be directed to an onsite lined retention basin, designed to minimize ground infiltration. The site soil characteristics greatly minimize the migration of materials into the soil over the life of the plant. However, the basin is sampled under the site's environmental monitoring plan. The sources of the potential water runoff contamination (albeit unlikely) would be either residual contamination on the cylinders from routine handling, or accidental releases of UF_6 and its derivatives resulting from a leaking cylinder or cylinder valve (caused by corrosion, transportation or handling accidents, or other factors). Operational evidence suggests that breaches in cylinders and the resulting leaks are "self-sealing." (See ER Section 4.13.3.1.2.)

The chemical and physical properties of UF_6 can pose potential health risks, and the material is handled accordingly. Uranium and its decay products emit low-levels of alpha, beta, gamma and neutron radiation. If UF_6 is released to the atmosphere, it reacts with water vapor in the air

to form hydrogen fluoride (HF) and the uranium oxyfluoride compound called uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2). These products are chemically toxic. Uranium is a heavy metal that, in addition to being radioactive, can have toxic chemical effects (primarily on the kidneys) if it enters the bloodstream by means of ingestion or inhalation. HF is an extremely corrosive gas that can damage the lungs and cause death if inhaled in high concentrations.

The NEA/IAEA (NEA, 2002) reports that there is widespread experience with the storage of UF_6 in steel cylinders in open-air storage yards. It is reported that even without routine treatment of localized corrosion, containers have maintained structural integrity for more than 50 years. The most extreme conditions experienced were in Russian Siberia where temperatures ranged from $+40^\circ\text{C}$ to -40°C ($+104^\circ\text{F}$ to -40°F), and from deep snow to full sun.

Depleted UF_6 can be safely stored for decades in painted steel cylinders in open-air storage yards. Internal corrosion does not represent a problem. A reaction between the UF_6 and inner surface of the cylinder forms a complex uranium oxifluoride layer between the UF_6 and cylinder wall that limits access of water moisture to the inside of the cylinder, thus further inhibiting internal corrosion. Moreover, while limiting factors are the external corrosion of the steel containers and the integrity of the "connection" seals, their impact can be minimized with an adequate preventive maintenance program. The three primary causes of external corrosion, all of which are preventable, are: (1) standing water on metal surfaces, (2) handling damaged cylinders and (3) the aging of cylinder paint.

Standing water problems can be minimized through proper yard drainage, use of support saddles, and periodic inspection. Handling damage can be minimized by appropriate labor training and yard access design. Aging can be minimized through the use of periodic inspection and repainting and the use of quality paint. At the NEF UBCs are placed on an outdoor storage pad of reinforced concrete. The pad is provided with a UBC Storage Pad Stormwater Retention Basin, concrete saddles on which the cylinders rest, and a mobile cylinder transporter. The stormwater collection system has sampling capabilities. The mobile transporter transfers cylinders from the UF_6 Handling Area of the Separations Building to the UBC Storage Pad where they rest on concrete saddles for storage. UBC transport between the Separations Building and the storage area is discussed in greater detail in the Safety Analysis Report Section 3.4.11, Material Handling Processes.

The Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Management Study (LES, 1991b) provides a plan for the storage of UBCs in a safe and cost-effective manner in accordance with all applicable regulations to protect the environment. The NEF will maintain an active cylinder management program to improve storage conditions in the cylinder yard, to monitor cylinder integrity by conducting routine inspections for breaches, and to perform cylinder maintenance and repairs to cylinders and the Storage Pad, as needed. The UBC Storage Pad has been sited to minimize the potential environmental impact from external radiation exposure to the public at the site boundary. The concrete pad to be initially constructed onsite for the storage of UBCs will only be of a size necessary to hold a few years worth of UBCs. It will be expanded, only if necessary. The dose equivalent rate from the UBC Storage Pad at the site boundary will be below the regulatory limits of 10 CFR 20 (CFR 2003q) and 40 CFR 190 (CFR, 2003f). The direct dose equivalent comes from the gamma-emitting progeny within the uranium decay chain. In addition, neutrons are produced by spontaneous fission in uranium and by the ^{19}F (alpha, n) ^{22}Na reaction. Thermoluminescent Dosimeters (TLDs) will be distributed along the site boundary fence line to monitor this impact due to photons (see ER Section 6.1), and ensure that

the estimated dose equivalent is not exceeded. See ER Section 4.12.2.1.3 for more detailed information on the impact of external dose equivalents from UBC Storage Pad.

The overall impact of the preferred UBC Storage Pad option is believed to be small given the comprehensive cylinder maintenance and inspection programs that have been instituted in Europe over the past 30 years. This experience has shown that outdoor UF_6 cylinder storage will have little or no adverse environmental impact when it is coupled with an effective and protective cylinder management program. In more than 30 years of operation at three different enrichment plants, the European cylinder management program has not resulted in any significant releases of UF_6 to the environment (see ER Section 3.11.2.2, Public and Occupational Exposure Limits, for information of the types of releases that have occurred at Urenco plants).

4.13.3.1.2 Mitigation for Depleted UF_6 Storage

Since UF_6 is a solid at ambient temperatures and pressures, it is not readily released from a cylinder following a leak or breach. When a cylinder is breached, moist air reacts with the exposed UF_6 solid and iron, resulting in the formation of a dense plug of solid uranium and iron compounds and a small amount of HF gas. This "self-healing" plug limits the amount of material released from a breached cylinder. When a cylinder breach is identified, the cylinder is typically repaired or its contents are transferred to a new cylinder.

LES will maintain an active cylinder management program to maintain optimum storage conditions in the cylinder yard, to monitor cylinder integrity by conducting routine inspections for breaches, and to perform cylinder maintenance and repairs to cylinders and the storage yard, as needed. The following handling and storage procedures and practices shall be adopted at the NEF to mitigate adverse events, by either reducing the probability of an adverse event or reducing the consequence should an adverse event occur (LES, 1991b).

- All filled UBCs will be stored in designated areas of the storage yard on concrete saddles (or saddles comprised of other material) that do not cause cylinder corrosion. These saddles shall be placed on a stable concrete surface.
- The storage array shall permit easy visual inspection of all cylinders.
- The UBCs shall be surveyed for external contamination (wipe tested) prior to being placed on the UBC Storage Pad or transported offsite. The maximum level of removable surface contamination allowed on the external surface of the cylinder shall be no greater than 0.4 Bq/cm^2 (22 dpm/cm^2) (beta, gamma, alpha) on accessible surfaces averaged over 300 cm^2 .
- UBC valves shall be fitted with valve guards to protect the cylinder valve during transfer and storage.
- Provisions are in place to ensure that UBCs do not have the defective valves (identified in NRC Bulletin 2003-03, "Potentially Defective 1-Inch Valves for Uranium Hexafluoride Cylinders" (NRC, 2003e) installed.
- All UBCs shall be abrasive-blasted and coated with a minimum of one coat of zinc chromate primer plus one zinc-rich topcoat or equivalent anti-corrosion treatment.
- Only designated vehicles with less than 280 L (74 gal) of fuel shall be allowed in the UBC Storage Pad area.

- Only trained and qualified personnel shall be allowed to operate vehicles on the UBC Storage Pad area.
- UBCs shall be inspected for damage prior to placing a filled cylinder on the Storage Pad.
- UBCs shall be re-inspected annually for damage or surface coating defects. These inspections shall verify that:
 - o Lifting points are free from distortion and cracking.
 - o Cylinder skirts and stiffener rings are free from distortion and cracking.
 - o Cylinder surfaces are free from bulges, dents, gouges, cracks, or significant corrosion.
 - o Cylinder valves are fitted with the correct protector and cap, the valve is straight and not distorted, 2 to 6 threads are visible, and the square head of the valve stem is undamaged.
 - o Cylinder plugs are undamaged and not leaking.
 - o If inspection of a UBC reveals significant deterioration (i.e., leakage, cracks, excessive distortion, bent or broken valves or plugs, broken or torn stiffening rings or skirts, or other conditions that may affect the safe use of the cylinder), the contents of the affected cylinder shall be transferred to another undamaged cylinder and the defective cylinder shall be discarded. The root cause of any significant deterioration shall be determined and, if necessary, additional inspections of cylinders shall be made.
 - o Proper documentation on the status of each UBC shall be available on site, including content and inspection dates.
 - o Cylinders containing liquid depleted UF₆ shall not be transported.
- Site stormwater runoff from the UBC Storage Pad is directed to a lined retention basin, which will be included in the site environmental monitoring plan. (See ER Section 6.1.)

4.13.3.1.3 Depleted UF₆ Disposition Alternatives

LES is committed to the temporary storage of UBCs on the NEF site as described in ER Section 4.13.3.1.1, Uranium Byproduct Cylinder (UBC) Storage. The preferred option and a "plausible strategy" for disposition of the UBCs is private sector conversion and disposal as described below. The disposition of UBCs by DOE conversion and disposal is described below since it is also a "plausible strategy," but is not considered the preferred option.

On April 24, 2002, LES submitted to the NRC information addressing depleted uranium disposition (LES, 2002). LES recommended that the NRC consider that the Section 3113 requirements of the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Privatization Act mandate, in LES's view, that DOE dispose of depleted uranium from a uranium enrichment facility licensed by the NRC. LES's position is that this approach constitutes a "plausible strategy" for dispositioning these materials. Subsequently, the NRC in its response to the LES submittal (NRC, 2003b) dated March 24, 2003, stated that the NRC "[c]onsiders that Section 3113 would be a "plausible strategy" for dispositioning depleted uranium tails if the NRC staff determines the depleted uranium is a low-level radioactive waste."

The NRC March 24, 2003 letter (NRC, 2003b) stated that the NRC expects LES to indicate in its NEF license application whether the depleted uranium tails will be treated as a waste or a

resource. LES will make a determination as to whether the depleted uranium is a resource or a waste and notify the NRC.

The NRC also noted in its letter to LES (NRC, 2003b), that the NEF license application should demonstrate that, given the expected constituents of the LES depleted uranium, the material meets the definition of low-level radioactive waste given in 10 CFR Part 61 (CFR, 2003r). The definition of low-level waste in 10 CFR 61 (CFR, 2003r) is radioactive waste not classified as high-level radioactive waste, transuranic waste, spent nuclear fuel, or byproduct material as defined in section 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act (uranium or thorium tailings and waste), 10 CFR 30 (CFR, 2003c), and 10 CFR 40 (CFR, 2003d). High-level radioactive waste (HLW) is primarily in the form of spent fuel discharged from commercial nuclear power reactors. The LES depleted uranium is produced as a result of enriching natural uranium feed material in the form of uranium hexafluoride. No spent fuel is used in the NEF. Therefore, the LES depleted uranium is not high-level waste nor does it contain any high-level waste.

A transuranic element is an artificially made, radioactive element that has an atomic number higher than uranium in the Periodic Table of Elements such as neptunium, plutonium, americium, and others. Transuranic waste is material contaminated with transuranic elements. It is produced primarily from reprocessing spent fuel and from the use of plutonium in the fabrication of nuclear weapons. Since the LES depleted uranium is produced as a result of enriching natural uranium feed material in the form of uranium hexafluoride, it contains no transuranic waste.

Spent nuclear fuel is fuel that has been removed from a nuclear reactor because it can no longer sustain power production for economic or other reasons. The LES depleted uranium is produced as a result of enriching natural uranium feed material in the form of uranium hexafluoride. Therefore, the LES depleted uranium is not nuclear fuel.

Section 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act classifies tailings produced from uranium ore as byproduct material. Tailings are the waste left after ore has been extracted from rock. The LES depleted uranium is produced as a result of enriching natural uranium feed material in the form of uranium hexafluoride, not from uranium ore or rock tailings. Therefore, the NEF depleted uranium is not byproduct material per section 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act.

10 CFR 30 (CFR, 2003c) states that byproduct material is any radioactive material, except special nuclear material, yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material. The LES depleted uranium is produced as a result of enriching natural uranium feed material in the form of uranium hexafluoride and is not made radioactive by exposure to radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

10 CFR 40 (CFR, 2003c) states that byproduct material is the tailings or wastes produced by the extraction or concentration of uranium or thorium from any ore processed primarily for its source material content, including discrete surface wastes resulting from uranium solution extraction processes. Underground ore bodies depleted by such solution extraction operations do not constitute "byproduct material" within this definition. The LES depleted uranium is produced as a result of enriching natural uranium feed material in the form of uranium hexafluoride and is not produced by extraction or concentration of uranium or thorium from ore.

The NEF depleted uranium is not high-level radioactive waste, contains no transuranic waste, spent nuclear fuel, or byproduct material as defined in Section 11e.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act, 10 CFR 30 (CFR, 2003c) and 10 CFR 40 (CFR, 2003d); therefore, once NEF depleted uranium

is determined by LES to be a waste and not a resource, it meets the 10 CFR 61 definition of low-level radioactive waste.

Disposition of the UBCs has several potential impacts that depend on the particular approach taken. Currently, the preferred options are short-term onsite storage followed by conversion and underground burial (Option 1 below) or transportation of the UBCs to a DOE conversion facility (Option 2 below). LES considered several other options in addition to the preferred options that could have implications on the number of UBCs stored at the NEF and the length of storage for the cylinders. All of these options are discussed below along with some of their impacts. However, at this time, LES considers only Options 1 and 2 below to represent plausible strategies for the disposition of its UBCs.

Option 1 – U.S. Private Sector Conversion and Disposal (Preferred Plausible Strategy)

Transporting depleted UF_6 from the NEF to a private sector conversion facility and depleted U_3O_8 permanent disposal in a western U.S. exhausted underground uranium mine is the preferred "plausible strategy" disposition option. The NRC repeatedly affirmed its acceptance of this option during its licensing review of the previous LES license application. In Section 4.2.2.8 of its final environmental impact statement (FEIS) for that application, the NRC staff noted that "it is plausible to assume that depleted UF_6 converted into U_3O_8 may be disposed by emplacement in near surface or deep geological disposal units" (NRC, 1994a). And during the subsequent adjudicatory hearing on that application, an NRC Atomic Safety and Licensing Board held that "[LES] has presented a plausible disposal strategy. [Its] plan to convert depleted UF_6 to U_3O_8 at an offsite facility in the United States and then ship that material as waste to a final site for deeper than surface burial is a reasonable and credible plan for depleted UF_6 disposal (NRC, 1997).

LES has committed to the Governor of New Mexico (LES, 2003b) that: (1) there will be no long-term disposal or long-term storage (beyond the life of the plant) of UBCs in the State of New Mexico; (2) a disposal path outside the State of New Mexico is utilized as soon as possible; (3) LES will aggressively pursue economically viable paths for UBCs as soon as they become available; (4) LES will work with qualified vendors pursuing construction of private deconversion facilities by entering in good faith discussions to provide such vendor long-term UBC contracts to assist them in their financing efforts; and (5) LES will put in place as part of the NRC license a financial surety bonding mechanism that assures funding will be available in the event of any default by LES.

ConverDyn, a company that is engaged in converting U_3O_8 material to UF_6 for enrichment, has the technical capability to construct and operate a depleted UF_6 to depleted U_3O_8 facility at its facility in Metropolis, Illinois in the future if there is an assured market. One of the two ConverDyn partners, General Atomics, may have access to an exhausted uranium mine (the Cotter Mines in Colorado) where depleted U_3O_8 could be disposed. Furthermore, discussions have recently been held with Cogema concerning a private conversion facility. Cogema has experience with such a facility currently processing depleted UF_6 in France. These factors support LES's position that this option is the preferred "plausible strategy" option.

Any deconversion facility used by NEF will not be located in the State of New Mexico.

Option 2 – DOE Conversion and Disposal (Plausible Strategy)

Transporting depleted UF_6 from the NEF to DOE conversion facilities for ultimate disposition is a plausible disposition option. Pursuant to Section 3113 of the USEC Privatization Act, DOE is instructed to "accept for disposal" depleted UF_6 , such as those that will be generated by the NRC-licensed NEF. To that end, DOE has recently contracted for the construction and

operation of two UF_6 conversion facilities to be located in Paducah, Kentucky and Portsmouth, Ohio.

DOE has recently reaffirmed the plausibility of this option. In a July 25, 2002 letter to Martin Virgilio, Director of the NRC Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, William Magwood IV, Director of DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, unequivocally stated that "in view of [DOE's] plans to build depleted uranium disposition facilities and the critical importance [DOE] places on maintaining a viable domestic uranium enrichment industry, [DOE] acknowledges that Section 3113 may constitute a "plausible strategy" for the disposal of depleted uranium from the private sector domestic uranium enrichment plant license applicants and operators." (DOE, 2002a)

Moreover, this plausible strategy is virtually identical to one considered by LES during its earlier licensing efforts before the NRC. During the adjudicatory hearing on LES's application, an NRC Atomic Safety and Licensing Board noted that "all parties apparently agree that LES's actual disposal method will be to transfer the tails to DOE and pay DOE's disposal charges" (footnote omitted) (NRC, 1997). LES considers that given the NRC's earlier acceptance of this option, DOE's current acceptance, and DOE's existing contractual commitment to ensure construction and operation of two depleted UF_6 conversion plants, this option to disposition its depleted UF_6 by way of DOE conversion and disposal remains plausible.

Option 3 - Foreign Re-Enrichment or Conversion and Disposal

The shipment of depleted UF_6 to either Canada, Europe or the Confederation of Independent States (CIS) (the former Soviet Union) for either re-enrichment or conversion and disposal would require that a bilateral agreement for cooperation exist between the U.S. and the subject foreign country so long as the depleted UF_6 continues to be classified as source material.

Option 3A - Russian Re-Enrichment

Because the U.S. does not yet have a bilateral agreement for cooperation with Russia, U.S. depleted UF_6 , as source material, cannot be shipped to Russia for re-enrichment. However, once there is a bilateral agreement in effect, source material could be re-enriched in Russia to about 0.7 % and returned to the U.S. or elsewhere, with the re-enrichment depleted UF_6 remaining in Russia.

Option 3B - French Conversion or Re-Enrichment

The shipment of depleted UF_6 to France for conversion to depleted U_3O_8 by Cogema and its return to the U.S. for disposal is a possible, though unlikely, option. However, the viability of this option would depend on Cogema's available capacity, the economics of transportation back and forward across the Atlantic, and the willingness of Areva, Cogema's parent company, to participate in a Urenco-sponsored venture.

There may be a French interest in re-enriching depleted UF_6 , for a price, and keeping the depleted UF_6 just as it would for a regular utility customer. Though Eurodif has excess capacity, its use would be electricity cost-dependent. This option is less likely to be implemented than either Option 1 or Option 2 above.

Option 3C - Kazakhstan Conversion and Disposal

While there may be an interest in Kazakhstan in converting depleted UF_6 to depleted U_3O_8 and disposing of it there, such interest is only speculative at this time. One way transportation economics costs could be a factor weighing against this option's employment.

4.13.3.1.4 Converted Depleted UF₆ Disposal Options

The following provides a brief summary of the different disposal options considered in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Alternative Strategies for the Long-Term Management and Use of Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride (DOE, 1999). Appendix I of the PEIS assessed disposal impacts of converted depleted UF₆. The information is based on pre-conceptual design data provided in the engineering analysis report (LLNL, 1997a). The PEIS was completed in April 1999 and identified conversion of depleted UF₆ to another chemical form for use or long-term storage as part of a preferred management alternative. In the corresponding Record of Decision (ROD) for the Long-Term Management and Use of Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride (FR, 1999), DOE decided to promptly convert the depleted UF₆ inventory to depleted uranium oxide, depleted uranium metal, or a combination of both.

Under the uranium oxide disposal alternative, depleted UF₆ would be chemically converted to a stable oxide form and disposed of below ground as LLW. The ROD further explained that depleted uranium oxide will be used as much as possible, and the remaining depleted uranium oxide will be stored for potential future uses or disposal, as necessary. In addition, according to the ROD, conversion to depleted uranium metal will occur only if uses for such metal are available. Disposal is defined as the emplacement of material in a manner designed to ensure isolation for the foreseeable future. Compared with long-term storage, disposal is considered to be permanent, with no intent to retrieve the material for future use. In fact, considerable and deliberate effort would be required to regain access to the material following disposal.

The PEIS considered several disposal options, including disposal in shallow earthen structures, below-ground vaults, and an underground mine. In addition, two physical waste forms were considered in the PEIS: ungrouted waste and grouted waste. Ungrouted waste refers to U₃O₈ or UO₂ in the powder or pellet form produced during the deconversion process. This bulk material would be disposed of in drums. Grouted waste refers to the solid material obtained by mixing the uranium oxide with cement and repackaging it in drums. Grouting is intended to increase structural strength and stability of the waste and to reduce the solubility of the waste in water. However, because cement would be added to the uranium oxide, grouting would increase the total volume of material requiring disposal. Grouting of waste was assumed to occur at the disposal facility. For each option, the U₃O₈ and UO₂ would be packaged for disposal as follows:

- U₃O₈ would be disposed of in 208 L (55-gal) drums. If ungrouted, approximately 714,000 drums would be required; if grouted, approximately 1,500,000 drums would be required.
- UO₂ would be disposed of in 110 L (30-gal) drums. These small drums would be used because of the greater density of UO₂, a filled 110-L (30-gal) drum would weigh about 605 kg (1,330 lbs). If ungrouted, approximately 740,000 drums would be required; if grouted, approximately 1,110,000 drums would be required.

All disposal options would include a central waste-form facility where drums of uranium oxide would be received from the deconversion facility and prepared for disposal. The waste-form facility would include an administration building, a receiving warehouse, and cementing/curing/short-term storage buildings (if necessary). Grouting of waste would be performed by mechanically mixing the uranium oxide with cement in large tanks and then pouring the mixture into drums. Once prepared for disposal (if necessary), drums would be moved into disposal units. For the grouted U₃O₈ option, the area of the waste-form facility would be approximately 3.6 ha (9 acres); for the grouted UO₂ option, the area would be about 4.5 ha (11 acres). For

ungROUTED disposal options; only about 3 ha (7 acres) would be required because the facilities for grouting, curing, and additional short-term storage would not be needed. The unique features of each disposal option are described below.

4.13.3.1.4.1 Disposal in Shallow Earthen Structures

Shallow earthen structures, commonly referred to as engineered trenches, are among the most commonly used forms of low-level waste disposal, especially in dry climates. Shallow earthen structures would be excavated to a depth of about 8 m (26 ft), with the length and width determined by site conditions and the annual volume of waste to be disposed of. Disposal in shallow earthen structures would consist of placing waste on a stable structural pad with barrier walls constructed of compacted clay. Clay would be used because it prevents the walls from collapsing or caving in, and it presents a relatively impermeable barrier to waste migration. The waste containers (i.e., drums) would be tightly stacked three pallets high in the bottom of the structure with forklifts. Any open space between containers would be filled with earth, sand, gravel, or other similar material as each layer of drums was placed. After the structure was filled, a 2-m (6-ft) thick cap composed of engineered fill dirt and clay would be placed on top and compacted. The cap would be mounded at least 1 m (3 ft) above the local grade and sloped to minimize the potential for water infiltration. Disposal would require about 30 ha (74 acres).

4.13.3.1.4.2 Disposal in Vaults

Concrete vaults for disposal would be divided into five sections, each section approximately 20 m (66 ft) long by 8 m (26 ft) wide and 4 m (13 ft) tall. As opposed to shallow earthen structures, the walls and floor of a vault would be constructed of reinforced concrete. A crane would be used to place the depleted U_3O_8 within each section. Once a vault was full, any open space between containers would be filled with earth, sand, gravel, or other similar material. A permanent roof slab of reinforced concrete that completely covers the vault would be installed after all five sections were filled. A cap of engineered fill dirt and clay would be placed on top of the concrete cover and compacted. The cap would be mounded above the local grade and sloped to minimize the potential for water infiltration. Disposal would require about 51 ha (125 acres).

4.13.3.1.4.3 Disposal in a Mine

An underground mine disposal facility would be a repository for permanent deep geological disposal. A mined disposal facility could possibly use a previously existing mine, or be constructed for the sole purpose of waste disposal. For purposes of comparing alternatives, the conservative assumption of constructing a new mine was assessed in the PEIS. A mine disposal facility would consist of surface facilities that provide space for waste receiving and inspection (the waste-form facility), and shafts and ramps for access to and ventilation of the underground portion of the repository. The underground portion would consist of tunnels (called "drifts") for the transport and disposal of waste underground. The dimensions of the drifts would be similar to those described previously for the storage options, except that each drift would have a width of 6.5 m (21 ft). Waste containers would be placed in drifts and back-filled. Disposal of ungrouted and grouted U_3O_8 would require about 91 ha (228 acres) and 185 ha

(462 acres) of underground disposal space, respectively. Disposal of ungrouted and grouted UO_2 would require about 70 ha (172 acres) and 102 ha (252 acres), respectively.

4.13.3.1.5 Potential Impacts of Each Disposal Option

This section provides a summary of the potential environmental impacts associated with the disposal of depleted uranium oxides in shallow earthen structures, vaults, and a mine during two distinct phases: (1) the operational phase and (2) the post-closure phase. Analysis of the operational phase included facility construction and the time during which waste would be actively placed in disposal units. Analysis of the post-closure phase considered potential impacts 1,000 years after the disposal units fail (i.e., release uranium material to the environment). For each phase, impacts were estimated for both generic wet and dry environmental settings. The following is presented as a general summary of potential environmental impacts during the operational phase:

- **Potential Adverse Impacts:** Potential adverse impacts during the operational phase would be small and generally similar for all options. Minor to moderate impacts would occur during construction activities, although these impacts would be temporary and easily mitigated by common engineering and good construction practices. Impacts during waste emplacement activities also would be small and limited to workers.
- **Wet or Dry Environmental Setting.** In general, potential impacts would be similar for generic wet and dry environmental settings during the operational phase.
- **U_3O_8 or UO_2 .** The potential disposal impacts tend to be slightly larger for U_3O_8 than for UO_2 because the volume of U_3O_8 would be greater and most environmental impacts tend to be proportional to the volume.
- **Grouted or Ungrouted Waste.** For both U_3O_8 and UO_2 , the disposal of grouted waste would result in larger impacts than disposal of ungrouted waste during the operational phase for two reasons: (1) grouting increases the volume of waste requiring disposal (by about 50%) and (2) grouting operations result in small emissions of uranium material to the air and water.
- **Shallow Earthen Structure, Vault, or Mine.** The potential impacts are essentially similar for disposal in a shallow earthen structure, vault, or mine. However, disposal in a mine could create slightly larger potential impacts if excavation of the mine was required (use of an existing mine would minimize impacts).

For the post-closure phase, impacts from disposal of U_3O_8 and UO_2 were calculated for a post-failure time of 1,000 years. The potential impacts estimated for the post-closure phase are subject to a great deal of uncertainty because of the extremely long time period considered and the dependence of predictions on the behavior of the waste material as it interacts with soil and water in a distant future environment. The post-closure impacts would depend greatly on the specific disposal facility design and site-specific characteristics. Because of these uncertainties, the assessment assumptions are generally selected to produce conservative estimates of impact, i.e., they tend to overestimate the expected impact. Changes in key disposal assumptions could yield significantly different results.

The following is presented as a general summary of potential environmental impacts during the post-closure phase:

- **Potential Adverse Impacts.** For all disposal options, potentially large impacts to human health and groundwater quality could occur within 1,000 years after failure of a facility in a wet setting, whereas essentially no impacts would occur from a dry setting in the same time frame. Potential impacts would result primarily from the contamination of groundwater. The maximum dose to an individual assumed to live at the edge of the disposal site and use the contaminated water was estimated to be about 1.1 mSv/yr (110 mrem/yr), which would exceed the 0.25 mSv/yr (25-mrem/yr) limit specified in 10 CFR 61 (CFR, 2003r) and DOE Order 5820.2A (DOE, 1988). (For comparison, the average dose equivalent to an individual from background radiation is about 2 to 3 mSv/yr (200 to 300 mrem/yr). Possible exposures (on the order of 0.1 Sv/yr (10 rem/yr) could occur for shallow earthen structures and vaults if the cover material were to erode and expose the uranium material; however, this would not arise until several thousand years later, and such exposure could be eliminated by adding new cover material to the top of the waste area.
- **Wet or Dry Environmental Setting.** The potential impacts would be significantly greater in a wet setting than in a dry setting. Specifically virtually no impacts would be expected in a dry setting for more than 1,000 years due to the low water infiltration rate and greater depth to the water table.
- **U₃O₈ or UO₂.** Overall, the potential environmental impacts tend to be slightly larger for U₃O₈ than for UO₂ because the volume of U₃O₈ requiring disposal would be greater than that of UO₂. A larger volume of waste essentially exposes a greater area of it to infiltrating water.
- **Grouted or UngROUTED Waste.** For both U₃O₈ and UO₂, the disposal of grouted waste would have larger environmental impacts than disposal of ungrouted waste, once the waste was exposed to the environment, because grouting would increase the waste volume. However, further studies using site-specific soil characteristics are necessary to determine the effect of grouting on long-term waste mobility. Grouting might reduce the dissolution rate of the waste and subsequent leaching of uranium into the groundwater in the first several hundred years after failure. However, over longer periods the grouted form would be expected to deteriorate and, because of the long half-life of uranium, the performance of grouted and ungrouted waste would be essentially the same. Depending on soil properties and characteristics of the grout material, it is also possible that grouting could increase the solubility of the uranium material by providing a carbonate-rich environment.
- **Shallow Earthen Structure, Vault, or Mine.** Because of the long time periods considered and the fact that the calculations were performed to characterize a time of 1,000 years after each facility was assumed to fail, the potential impacts are very similar among the options of for disposal in a shallow earthen structure, vault, or mine. However, shallow earthen structures would be expected to contain the waste material for a period of at least several hundred years before failure, whereas vaults and a mine would be expected to last even longer — from several hundred years to a thousand years or more. Therefore, vault and mine disposal would provide greater protection of waste in a wet environment. In addition, both vault and a mine would be expected to provide additional protection against erosion of the cover material (and possible resultant surface exposure of the waste material) as compared to shallow earthen structures. The exact time that any disposal facility would perform as designed would depend on the specific facility design and site characteristics.

In NUREG-1484 (NRC, 1994a), Section 4.2.2.8, the NRC provided a generic evaluation of the impacts of disposal of depleted uranium oxides. This generic evaluation was done since there are no actual disposal facilities for large quantities of depleted UF₆. The depleted UF₆ disposal

impact analysis method included selection of assumed generic disposal sites, development of undisturbed performance and deep well water use exposure scenarios, and estimation of potential doses.

Exposure pathways used for the near-surface disposal case included drinking shallow well water and consuming crops irrigated with shallow well water. Evaluation of the deep disposal case included undisturbed performance and deep well water exposure scenarios. In the undisturbed performance scenario, groundwater flows into a river that serves as a source of drinking water and fish. For the well water use exposure scenario, an individual drills a well into an aquifer down gradient from the disposal facility and uses groundwater for drinking and irrigation.

The release of uranium isotopes and their daughter nuclides from the disposal facility is limited by their solubility in water. Using the environmental characteristics of a humid southeastern U.S. site and the methods of the EIS, drinking water and agricultural doses were conservatively estimated, for a near surface disposal facility, to exceed 10 CFR 61 limits (CFR, 2003r).

In order to compensate for the lack of knowledge of a specific deep disposal site, two representative sites whose geological structures have previously been characterized were selected for the NRC analysis. Potential consequences of emplacement of U_3O_8 in a geological disposal unit include intake of radionuclides from drinking water, irrigated crops, and fish. Under the assumed conditions for the undisturbed performance scenario, groundwater would be discharged to a river. Under conditions not expected to occur, an individual would obtain groundwater by drilling a well down gradient from the disposal unit.

The estimated impacts for a deep disposal facility were less than the 0.25 mSv/yr (25 mrem/yr) level adopted from 10 CFR 61 (CFR, 2003r) as a basis for comparison. The assumptions used in the analysis, included neglect of potential engineered barriers, mass transfer limitations in releases, and decay and retardation during vertical transfer contribute to a conservative analysis.

The evaluation also concluded that UBCs can be stored indefinitely in a retrievable surface facility with minimal environmental impacts. The environmental impacts associated with such storage would be commitment of the land for a storage area, and a small offsite radiation dose.

4.13.3.1.6 Costs Associated with Depleted UF_6 Conversion and Disposal

This section presents cost estimates for the conversion of depleted uranium hexafluoride (depleted UF_6) and the disposal of the depleted triuranium octoxide (depleted U_3O_8) produced during deconversion. It also presents cost estimates for the associated transportation of depleted UF_6 to the conversion plant and the transportation of depleted U_3O_8 to the disposal site. The cost estimates were obtained from analyses of four sources: a 1997 study by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), the Uranium Disposition Services, LLC (UDS) contract with the Department of Energy (DOE) dated August 29, 2002, information from Urenco related to depleted UF_6 disposition costs including conversion, and the costs submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) by LES as part of the Claiborne Energy Center (CEC) license application in the early 1990s (LES, 1993). The estimated cost to dispose of depleted U_3O_8 in an exhausted uranium mine was also assessed.

This section reviews cost estimates developed by LLNL for the interim storage of the current very large United States (U.S.) inventory of depleted UF_6 at DOE conversion facilities, the DOE

preferred option of conversion of depleted UF_6 to depleted U_3O_8 at DOE facilities, the ultimate disposal of depleted U_3O_8 at DOE sites, and the transportation of depleted UF_6 and depleted U_3O_8 (LLNL, 1997a). While cost estimates for other disposition alternatives (e.g. conversion to uranium oxide (UO_2)) were reviewed they are not addressed in this section since they were not considered as being applicable to LES. It is noted that the LLNL study estimates are reported in 1996 discounted dollars.

This section reviews the UDS-DOE contract since it is regarded as being more credible than an estimate because it represents actual U.S. cost data (DOE, 2002b). Unfortunately the UDS contract does not provide a breakdown of the conversion and disposal cost components.

This section also reflects information on depleted UF_6 disposition cost by European fuel cycle supplier, Urenco. The disposal costs submitted to the NRC in support of the Claiborne Energy Center license application to the NRC in the early 1990s were also reviewed (LES, 1993).

This section is based on an analysis of reports and literature in the public domain as well as information provided by Urenco and the experience of expert consultants.

In August 2001 the DOE reported that it had an inventory of depleted UF_6 enrichment tails material amounting to 55,000 (60,627), 193,000 (212,746) and 449,000 (494,938) metric tons (tons) stored at its enrichment sites at Oak Ridge in Tennessee, at Portsmouth in Ohio, and at Paducah in Kentucky, respectively (DOE, 2001d). This total of approximately 700,000 MT (771,617 tons) of depleted UF_6 corresponds to about 470,000 MT (518,086 tons) of uranium (MTU) as UF_6 , a figure that is obtained by multiplying the mass of depleted UF_6 by the mass fraction of U to UF_6 , i.e., 0.676. The depleted UF_6 is stored in approximately 60,000 steel cylinders, some dating back to about 1947 (DOE, 2001e). On October 31, 2000, the DOE issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) to construct depleted UF_6 to depleted U_3O_8 conversion facilities at the Portsmouth and Paducah sites in order to begin management and disposition of the UBCs accumulated at its three sites (DOE, 2000a). The DOE plans to ship the depleted UF_6 stored at the East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP) at Oak Ridge to Portsmouth for conversion.

Since the 1950s, the government has stored depleted UF_6 in an array of large steel cylinders at Oak Ridge, Paducah, and Portsmouth. Several different cylinder types, including 137 nominal 19-ton cylinders (Paducah) made of former UF_6 gaseous diffusion conversion shells, are in use, although the vast majority of cylinders have a 12 MT (14 ton) capacity. The cylinders are typically 3.7 m (12 ft) long by 1.2 m (4 ft) in diameter, with most having a thin wall thickness of 0.79 cm (5/16 in) of steel. Similar but smaller cylinders are also in use. Thick-walled cylinders, 48Ys that have a 1.6 cm (5/8 in) wall thickness, will be used by LES for storage and transport. The cylinders managed by DOE at the three sites are typically stacked two cylinders high in large areas called yards.

The DOE and USEC Inc. cylinders considered acceptable for UF_6 handling and shipping are referred to as conforming cylinders in the LLNL study. LLNL notes that the old or corroded cylinders that will not meet the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) specifications (ANSI, applicable version), non-conforming cylinders, will require either special handling and special over-packs or transfer of contents to approved cylinders, and approval by regulatory agencies such as the Department of Transportation (DOE, 2001d). The LLNL report estimated high costs for the management and transporting of 29,083 non-conforming cylinders in the study's reference case, approximately 63% of the total of 46,422 cylinders in the study. There are approximately 4,683 cylinders at the Oak Ridge ETTP that the DOE has determined should

be transported to the Portsmouth site for disposition. The LLNL report estimated that the life-cycle cost of developing special over-packs and constructing and operating a transfer facility for the DOE's non-conforming cylinders could be as much as \$604 million, in discounted 1996 dollars (LLNL, 1997a).

On August 29, 2002, the DOE announced the competitive selection of UDS to design, construct, and operate conversion facilities near the Paducah and Portsmouth gaseous diffusion plants. UDS will operate these facilities for the first five years, beginning in 2005. The UDS contract runs from August 29, 2002 to August 3, 2010. UDS will also be responsible for maintaining the depleted uranium and product inventories and transporting depleted uranium from ETTP to the Portsmouth for conversion. The DOE-UDS contract scope includes packaging, transporting and disposing of the conversion product depleted U_3O_8 at a government waste disposal site such as the Nevada Test Site (NTS) (DOE, 2002b).

UDS is a consortium formed by Framatome ANP, Inc., Duratek Federal Services, Inc., and Burns and Roe Enterprises, Inc. The estimated value of the cost reimbursement contract is \$558 million (DOE, 2002c). Design, construction and operation of the facilities will be subject to appropriations of funds from Congress. On December 19, 2002, the White House confirmed that funding for both conversion facilities will be included in President Bush's 2004 budget. President Bush signed the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill on December 1, 2003 which included funding for both conversion facilities.

The NEF UBCs will all be thick-walled conforming 48Y cylinders. The 48Y cylinders have a gross weight of about 14.9 MT (16.4 tons), and when filled, will normally contain 12.5 MT (13.8 tons) of UF_6 or about 8.5 MTU (9.4 tons). The management and transporting of the LES UBCs will not involve unusual costs such as those that will be required for the majority of the DOE-managed cylinders currently stored at the three government sites.

In May 1997, LLNL published a cost analysis report for the long-term management of depleted uranium hexafluoride (LLNL, 1997a). The report was prepared to provide comparative life-cycle cost data for the Department of Energy's (DOE) Draft 1997 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) on alternative strategies for management and disposition of depleted UF_6 (DOE, 1997a). The LLNL report appears to be the most comprehensive recent assessment of depleted UF_6 disposition costs available in the public domain. The technical data on which the LLNL cost analysis report is based, is principally the May 1997 Engineering Analysis Report, also by LLNL (LLNL, 1997b). The April 1999 Final PEIS identified as soon as practicable conversion of DUF_6 to another stable chemical form, uranium oxide (or metal if there is a use for it), the DOE-preferred management alternative (DOE, 1999).

The LLNL costs, which are reported in discounted 1996 dollars (first quarter), were undiscounted and adjusted upward by 11% to 2002 dollars using the U.S. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) Implicit Price Deflator (IPD).

When the LLNL report was prepared in 1997, more than five years ago, the cost estimates in it were based on an inventory of 560,000 MT (617,294 tons) of depleted UF_6 , or 378,600 MTU (417,335 tons uranium) after applying the 0.676 mass fraction multiplier. This inventory equates over the 20 years of the study to an annual throughput rate of 28,000 MT (30,865 tons) of UF_6 or about 19,000 MT (20,943 tons) of depleted uranium, which is approximately 3.6 times the expected annual UBC output of the proposed NEF. The costs in the LLNL report are based on the life-cycle quantity of 378,600 MTU (417,335 tons uranium), beginning in 2009.

The LLNL cost analyses assumed that the depleted UF_6 would be converted to depleted U_3O_8 , the DOE's preferred disposal form, using one of two dry process conversion alternatives. The first alternative, the AHF option, upgrades the hydrogen fluoride (HF) product to anhydrous HF (<1.0% water). In the second option, the HF neutralization alternative, the HF would be neutralized with lime to produce calcium fluoride (CaF_2). The LLNL cost analyses assumed that the AHF and CaF_2 conversion products would have negligible uranium contamination and could be sold for unrestricted use. LES will not use a deconversion facility that employs a process that results in the production of anhydrous HF.

Table 4.13-2, LLNL Estimated Life-Cycle Costs for DOE Depleted UF_6 to Depleted U_3O_8 Conversion, presents the LLNL-estimated life-cycle capital, operating, and regulatory discounted costs in 1996 dollars, for conversion of 378,600 MTU (417,335 tons uranium) over 20 years, of depleted UF_6 to depleted U_3O_8 by anhydrous hydrogen fluoride (AHF) and HF neutralization processing. The costs were extracted from Table 4.8 in the LLNL report. The discounted LLNL life-cycle costs in 1996 dollars were undiscounted and converted to per kg unit costs and adjusted to 2002 dollars using the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) Implicit Price Deflator (IPD), as shown in the table. The escalation adjustment resulted in the 1996 costs being increased by 11%.

The anhydrous hydrogen fluoride (AHF) conversion option for which LLNL provides a cost estimate assumes that the AHF by-product is saleable, and that total sales revenues over the 20 years of operation would amount to \$77.32 million, in discounted dollars. LLNL also assumed that the life-cycle sale of CaF_2 obtained from neutralizing HF with lime would result in discounted revenues of \$11.02 million.

The cost estimates for the conversion facility assumed that all major buildings are to be structural steel frame construction, except for the process building which is a two story reinforced concrete structure. Most of this building is assumed to be "special construction" with 0.3-m (1-ft) thick concrete perimeter walls and ceilings, 8-in concrete interior walls, and 0.6-m (2-ft) thick concrete floor mat. The "standard construction" area walls were taken to be 8-in thick concrete with 15-cm (6-in) elevated floors and 20 cm (8-in) concrete floors slabs on grade.

Table 4.13-3, Summary of LLNL Estimated Capital, Operating and Regulatory Unit Costs for DOE depleted UF_6 to Depleted U_3O_8 Conversion, presents a summary of estimated capital, operating and regulatory costs for depleted UF_6 to depleted U_3O_8 conversion on a dollars per kgU basis, in both 1996 and 2002 dollars, undiscounted. It can be seen that in either case the conversion process is operations and maintenance intensive.

Table 4.13-4, LLNL Estimated Life Cycle Costs for DOE Depleted UF_6 Disposal Alternatives, presents LLNL-estimated life-cycle costs for the waste form preparation and disposal of DOE depleted U_3O_8 produced by conversion of depleted UF_6 . The table presents estimated costs for two depleted U_3O_8 disposal alternatives: shallow earthen structures (engineered "trenches") and concrete vaults. The waste form preparation for each alternative consists primarily of loading, compacting, and sealing the depleted U_3O_8 into 208-L (55-gal) steel drums.

The LLNL-estimated life-cycle costs for depleted U_3O_8 disposal range from \$86 million, in discounted 1996 dollars, for the engineered trench alternative to \$180 million for depleted U_3O_8 disposal in a concrete vault. The disposal unit costs range from \$1.46 per kgU to \$2.17 per kgU, in 2002 dollars. As discussed later in this section, the LLNL-estimated concrete vault costs are higher than those that would be required to either sink a new underground mine or to refurbish and operate an existing exhausted mine, an alternative that the NRC has indicated to be acceptable (ORNL, 1995). For example, the capital cost for the concrete vault alternative of

\$130.75 million in discounted 1996 dollars or \$349.7 million in undiscounted 2002 dollars is far greater than the \$12.4 million cost of a new 200 MT (220 tons) per day underground mine, as shown later in this section.

Table 4.13-5, Summary of Total Estimated Conversion and Disposal Costs presents the depleted UF_6 conversion and depleted U_3O_8 disposal costs already discussed on a dollar per kgU basis, in undiscounted 2002 dollars. In addition it also includes the LLNL-estimated cost to DOE of rail transportation (including loading and unloading) of conforming depleted UF_6 cylinders to the conversion facility site and drummed depleted U_3O_8 to the disposal sites. It does not include interim storage costs since it may reasonably be assumed that LES UBCs may be shipped directly to the deconversion facility. The table indicates that the total costs for depleted UF_6 disposal in, in 2002 dollars, based on the LLNL study estimates, is likely to range from about \$5.06 to \$5.81 per kgU.

On August 29, 2002, the DOE announced the competitive selection of UDS to design and construct conversion facilities near the DOE enrichment plants at Paducah, Kentucky and Portsmouth, Ohio, and to operate these facilities from 2006 to 2010. UDS will also be responsible for maintaining the depleted uranium and conversion product inventories and transporting depleted uranium from Oak Ridge East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP) to the Portsmouth site for conversion. The contract scope includes packaging, transporting and disposing of the conversion product depleted U_3O_8 . Table 4.13-6, DOE UDS August 29, 2002 Contract Quantities and Costs presents a summary of the UDS contract quantities and costs.

The DOE-estimated value of the cost reimbursement incentive fee contract, which runs from August 29, 2002 to August 3, 2010, is \$558 million (DOE, 2002c). Design, construction and operation of the facilities will be subject to appropriations of funds from Congress. On December 19, 2002, the White House confirmed that funding for both conversion facilities will be included in President Bush's 2004 budget. However, the Office of Management and Budget has not yet indicated how much funding will be allocated. Framatome is a subsidiary of Areva, the French company whose subsidiary Cogema has operated the world's only existing commercial depleted UF_6 conversion plant since 1984.

The table shows the target deconversion quantities and the estimated fee. The contract calls for the construction of a 12,200 MTU (13,448 tons uranium) per year conversion plant at Paducah and a 9,100 MTU (10,031 tons uranium) per year conversion plant at Portsmouth, for an annual nominal total capacity of 21.3 million kgU (23,479 tons uranium), which is also the target conversion rate per year. Based on the target conversion rate the UDS contract total unit capital cost is estimated to be \$0.77 per kgU (\$0.35 per lb U). This unit cost is based on plant operation over 25 years and 6% government cost of money. The conversion, disposal and material management total operating cost during the first five years of operation corresponds to \$3.15 per kgU. The total unit capital and operating cost is \$3.92 per kgU. As noted earlier in this section, the DOE has indicated that the disposal of the depleted U_3O_8 may take place at the Nevada Test Site. The cost to DOE of depleted U_3O_8 disposal at NTS is currently estimated at \$7.50 per ft^3 or about \$0.11 per kgU (\$0.05 per lb U). In 1994 it was reported that the NTS charge to the DOE of \$10 per ft^3 (\$0.15 per kgU) was not a full cost recovery rate (EGG, 1994).

It is of interest to note that USEC entered into an agreement with the DOE on June 30, 1998, wherein it agreed to pay the DOE \$50,021,940 immediately prior to privatization for a commitment by the DOE "for storage, management and disposition of the transferred depleted uranium..." generated by USEC during the FY 1999 to FY 2004 time period (DOE, 1998).

Under the terms of the agreement, the DOE also committed to perform "...research and development into the beneficial use of depleted uranium, and related activities and support services for depleted uranium-related activities". The agreement specifies that USEC will transfer to the DOE title to and possession of 2,026 48G cylinders containing approximately 16,673,980 kgU (18,380 tons of uranium). Under this agreement, DOE effectively committed to dispose of the USEC DUF₆ at an average rate of approximately 3.0 million kgU per year between the middle of calendar 1998 and the end of 2003 at a cost of exactly \$3.00 per kgU (\$1.36 per lb U), in 1998 dollars.

According to Urenco its depleted UF₆ disposal will be similar to those that will be generated by LES at the NEF. Urenco contracts with a supplier for depleted UF₆ to depleted U₃O₈ conversion. The supplier has been converting depleted UF₆ to depleted U₃O₈ on an industrial scale since 1984.

The Claiborne Energy Center costs given in Table 4.13-7, Summary of Depleted UF₆ Disposal Costs from Four Sources are based upon those presented to John Hickey of the NRC in the LES letter of June 30, 1993 (LES, 1993) as adjusted for changes in units and escalated to 2002. A conversion cost of \$4.00 per kgU was provided to LES by Cogema at that time. A value of \$1.00 per kgU U₃O₈ (\$0.45 lb U₃O₈) depleted U₃O₈ disposal cost was based on information provided by Urenco at the time.

As indicated earlier in this section, the NRC has noted that an existing exhausted underground uranium mine would be a suitable repository for depleted U₃O₈ (NRC, 1995). For purposes of comparing alternatives, the conservative assumption of constructing a new mine was assessed. A mine disposal facility would consist of surface facilities for waste receiving and inspection (the waste-form facility), and shafts and ramps for access to and ventilation of the underground portion of the repository, and appropriate underground transport and handling equipment. The mine underground would consist of tunnels (called "drifts") and cross-cuts for the transport and storage of stacked 208-L (55-gal) steel drums which are then back-filled. A great many features of a typical underground mine would be applicable to this disposal alternative.

The NEF, when operating at its nominal full capacity of 3.0 million Separative Work Units (SWUs) per year will produce 7,800 MT (8,598 tons) of depleted UF₆. A typical U.S. underground mine, operating for five days per week over fifty weeks of the year, excepting ten holiday days per year, would operate for 240 days per year. Thus, if LES UBCs were disposed uniformly over the year, the average disposal rate would be 32.5 MT (35.8 tons) of depleted UF₆ per day. This is much less than the rate of ore production in even a typical small underground mine. However, it may reasonably be assumed that the rate of emplacement of the drummed depleted U₃O₈ would be less than the rate of ore removal from a typical underground mine.

The estimated capital and operating costs for a 200 MT per day underground metal mine in a U.S. setting was provided by a U.S. mining engineering company, Western Mine Engineering, Inc. The costs are for a vein type mine accessed by a 160-m (524-ft) deep vertical shaft with rail type underground haulage transport. The operating costs for the 200 MT per day mine is estimated to be \$0.07 per kg (\$0.03 per lb) of ore and the capital cost is estimated to be approximately \$0.04 per kg (\$0.02 per lb) of ore, for a total cost of \$0.11 per kg (\$0.05 per lb) of ore. The capital cost of the mine is \$12.4 million 2002 dollars. In the case of an existing exhausted mine the capital costs could be much less.

The mine cost estimates presented indicate that the assumption of the much higher costs presented in Table 4.13-4, LLNL Estimated Life Cycle Costs for DOE Depleted UF₆ Disposal

Alternatives for the concrete vault alternative, represents an upper bound cost estimate for depleted U_3O_8 disposal. For example, the capital cost of the concrete vault alternative, which may be obtained by undiscounting the LLNL estimate costs presented in Table 4.13-4, is \$350 million in 2002 dollars, or 28 times the capital cost of the 200 MT (220 tons) mine discussed above.

The four sets of cost estimates obtained are presented in Table 4.13-7 in 2002 dollars per kgU. Note that the Claiborne Enrichment Center cost had a greater uncertainty associated with it. The UDS contract does not allow the component costs for conversion, disposal and transportation to be estimated. The costs in the table indicate that \$5.50 per kgU (\$2.50 per lb U) is a conservative and, therefore, prudent estimate of total depleted UF_6 disposition cost for the LES NEF. That is, the historical estimates from LLNL and CEC and the more recent actual costs from the UDS contract were used to inform the LES cost estimate. Urenco has reviewed this estimate and, based on its current cost for UBC disposal, finds this figure to be prudent.

Based on information from corresponding vendors, the value of \$5.50 per kgU (2002 dollars), which is equal to \$5.70 per kgU when escalated to 2004 dollars, was revised in December 2004 to \$4.68 per kgU (2004 dollars). The value of \$4.68 per kgU was derived from the estimates of costs from the three components that make up the total disposition cost of DUF_6 (i.e., deconversion, disposal, and transportation). The estimate of \$4.68 per kgU supports the Preferred Plausible Strategy of U.S. Private Sector Conversion and Disposal identified in section 4.13.3.1.3 of the ER as Option 1.

In support of the Option 2 Plausible Strategy identified in section 4.13.3.1.3 of the ER, "DOE Conversion and Disposal," LES requested a cost estimate from the Department of Energy (DOE). On March 1, 2005, DOE provided a cost estimate to LES for the components that make up the total disposition cost (i.e., deconversion, disposal, and transportation) (DOE, 2005). This estimate, which was based upon an independent analysis undertaken by DOE's consultant, LMI Government Consulting, estimated the cost of disposition to total approximately \$4.91 per kgU (2004 dollars). The Department's cost estimate for deconversion, storage, and disposal of the DU is consistent with the contract between UDS and DOE. The cost estimate does not assume any resale or reuse of any products resulting from the conversion process.

For purposes of determining the total tails disposition funding requirement and the amount of financial assurance required for this purpose, the value of \$4.68 per kgU (based upon the cost estimate for the Preferred Plausible Strategy) was selected.

4.13.3.2 Water Quality Limits

All plant effluents are contained on the NEF site. A series of evaporation retention/detention basins, and septic systems are used to contain the plant effluents. There will be no discharges to a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW). Contaminated water is treated to the limits in 10 CFR 20.2003, 10 CFR 20, Appendix B, Table 3 and to administrative levels recommended by Regulatory Guide 8.37 (CFR, 2003q; NRC, 1993). Refer to ER Section 4.4, Water Resource Impacts, for additional water quality standards and permits for the NEF. ER Section 3.12, Waste Management, also contains information on the NEF systems and procedures to ensure water quality.

4.13.4 Waste Minimization

The highest priority has been assigned to minimizing the generation of waste through reduction, reuse or recycling. The NEF incorporates several waste minimization systems in its operational procedures that aim at conserving materials and recycling important compounds. For example, all Fomblin Oil will be recovered where practical. Fomblin Oil is an expensive, highly fluorinated, inert oil selected specifically for use in UF_6 systems to avoid reactions with UF_6 . The NEF will also have in place a Decontamination Workshop designed to remove radioactive contamination from equipment and allow some equipment to be reused rather than treated as waste.

In addition, the NEF process systems that handle UF_6 , other than the Product Liquid Sampling System, will operate entirely at subatmospheric pressure to prevent outward leakage of UF_6 . Cylinders, initially containing liquid UF_6 , will be transported only after being cooled, so that the UF_6 is in solid form, to minimize the potential risk of accidental releases due to mishandling.

The NEF is designed to minimize the usage of natural and depletable resources. Closed-loop cooling systems have been incorporated in the designs to reduce water usage. Power usage will be minimized by efficient design of lighting systems, selection of high-efficiency motors, and use of proper insulation materials.

ALARA controls will be maintained during facility operation to account for standard waste minimization practices as directed in 10 CFR 20 (CFR, 2003q). The outer packaging associated with consumables will be removed prior to use in a contaminated area. The use of glove boxes will minimize the spread of contamination and waste generation.

Collected waste such as trash, compressible dry waste, scrap metals, and other candidate wastes will be volume reduced at a centralized waste processing facility. This facility could be operated by a commercial vendor such as GTS Duratek. This facility would further reduce generated waste to a minimum quantity prior to final disposal at a land disposal facility or potential reuse.

4.13.4.1 Control and Conservation

The features and systems described below serve to limit, collect, confine, and treat wastes and effluents that result from the UF_6 enrichment process. A number of chemicals and processes are used in fulfilling these functions. As with any chemical/industrial facility, a wide variety of waste types will be produced. Waste and effluent control is addressed below as well as the features and systems used to conserve resources.

4.13.4.1.1 Mitigating Effluent Releases

The equipment and design features incorporated in the NEF are selected to keep the release of gaseous and liquid effluent contaminants as low as practicable, and within regulatory limits. They are also selected to minimize the use of depletable resources. Equipment and design features for limiting effluent releases during normal operation are described below:

The process systems that handle UF_6 operate almost entirely at sub-atmospheric pressures. Such operation results in no outward leakage of UF_6 to any effluent stream.

- The one location where UF_6 pressure is raised above atmospheric pressure is in the piping and cylinders inside the sampling autoclave. The piping and cylinders inside the autoclave confine the UF_6 . In the event of leakage, the sampling autoclave provides secondary containment of UF_6 .
- Cylinders of UF_6 are transported only when cool and when the UF_6 is in solid form. This minimizes risk of inadvertent releases due to mishandling.
- Process off-gas, from UF_6 purification and other operations, is discharged through desublimers to solidify and reclaim as much UF_6 as possible. Remaining gases are discharged through high-efficiency filters and chemical adsorbent beds. The filters and adsorbents remove HF and uranium compounds left in the gaseous effluent stream.
- Liquids and solids in the process systems collect uranium compounds. When these liquids and solids (e.g., oils, damaged piping, or equipment) are removed for cleaning or maintenance, portions end up in wastes and effluent. Different processes are employed to separate uranium compounds and other materials (such as various heavy metals) from the resulting wastes and effluent. These processes are described in ER Section 4.13.4.2 below.
- Processes used to clean up wastes and effluent create their own wastes and effluent as well. Control of these is also accomplished by liquid and solid waste handling systems and techniques, which are described in detail in the Sections below. In general, careful applications of basic principles for waste handling are followed in all of the systems and processes. Different waste types are collected in separate containers to minimize contamination of one waste type with another. Materials that can cause airborne contamination are carefully packaged; ventilation and filtration of the air in the area is provided as necessary. Liquid wastes are confined to piping, tanks, and other containers; curbing, pits, and sumps are used to collect and contain leaks and spills. Hazardous wastes are stored in designated areas in carefully labeled containers; mixed wastes are also contained and stored separately. Strong acids and caustics are neutralized before entering an effluent stream. Radioactively contaminated wastes are decontaminated insofar as possible to reduce waste volume.
- Following handling and treatment processes to limit wastes and effluent, sampling and monitoring is performed to assure regulatory and administrative limits are met. Gaseous effluent is monitored for HF and is sampled for radioactive contamination before release; liquid effluent is sampled and/or monitored in liquid waste systems; solid wastes are sampled and/or monitored prior to offsite treatment and disposal. Samples are returned to their source where feasible to minimize input to waste streams.

4.13.4.1.2 Conserving Depletable Resources

The NEF design serves to minimize the use of depletable resources. Water is the primary depletable resource used at the facility. Electric power usage also depletes fuel sources used in the production of the power. Other depletable resources are used only in small quantities. Chemical usage is minimized not only to conserve resources, but also to preclude excessive waste production. Recyclable materials are used and recycled wherever practicable.

The main feature incorporated in the NEF to limit water consumption is the use of closed-loop cooling systems.

5 The NEF is designed to minimize the usage of natural and depletable resources as shown by the following measures:

- The use of low-water consumption landscaping versus conventional landscaping reduces water usage.
- The installation of low flow toilets, sinks and showers reduces water usage when compared to standard flow fixtures.
- Localized floor washing using mops and self-contained cleaning machines reduces water usage compared to conventional washing with a hose twice per week.
- The use of high efficiency washing machines compared to standard machines reduces water usage.
- The use of high efficiency closed cell cooling towers (water/air cooling) versus open cell design reduces water usage.
- Closed-loop cooling systems have been incorporated to reduce water usage.

Power usage is minimized by efficient design of lighting systems, selection of high-efficiency motors, use of appropriate building insulation materials, and other good engineering practices. The demand for power in the process systems is a major portion of plant operating cost; efficient design of components is incorporated throughout process systems.

4.13.4.1.3 Prevention and Control of Oil Spills

5 The NEF will implement a spill control program for accidental oil spills. The purpose of the spill control program will be to reduce the potential for the occurrence of spills, reduce the risk of injury in case of a spill occurs, minimize the impact of a spill, and provide a procedure for the cleanup and reporting of spills. The oil spill control program will be established to comply with the requirements of 40 CFR 112 (CFR, 2003aa), Oil Pollution Prevention. As required by Part 112, a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) plan will be prepared prior to either the start of facility operation of the facility or prior to the storage of oil onsite in excess of the de minimis quantities established in 40 CFR 112.1(d) (CFR, 2003aa). The SPCC Plan will be reviewed and certified by a Professional Engineer and will be maintained onsite.

As a minimum the SPCC Plan will contain the following information:

- Identification of potential significant sources of spills and a prediction of the direction and quantity of flow that would result from a spill from each such source;
- Identification the use of containment or diversionary structures such as dikes, berms, culverts, booms, sumps, and diversion ponds to be used at the facility where appropriate to prevent discharged oil from reaching navigable waters;
- Procedures for inspection of potential sources of spills and spill containment/diversion structures; and
- Assigned responsibilities for implementing the plan, inspections, and reporting.

In addition to preparation and implementation of the SPCC Plan, the facility will comply with the specific spill prevention and control guidelines contained in 40 CFR 112.7(e) (CFR, 2003aa), such as drainage of rain water from diked areas, containment of oil in bulk storage tanks, above ground tank integrity testing, and oil transfer operational safeguards.

4.13.4.2 Reprocessing and Recovery Systems

Systems used to allow recovery or reuse of materials are described below.

4.13.4.2.1 Fomblin Oil Recovery System

Fomblin oil is an expensive, highly fluorinated, inert oil selected specifically for use in UF_6 systems to avoid reaction with UF_6 . The Fomblin Oil Recovery System recovers used Fomblin oil from pumps used in UF_6 systems. All Fomblin oil is recovered; none is normally released as waste or effluent.

Used Fomblin oil is recovered by removing impurities that inhibit the oil's lubrication properties. The impurities collected are primarily uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2) and uranium tetrafluoride (UF_4) particles. The recovery process also removes trace amounts of hydrocarbons, which if left in the oil would react with UF_6 . The Fomblin Oil Recovery System components are located in the Decontaminated Workshop in the Technical Services Building (TSB). The total annual volume of oil to be processed in this system is approximately 535 L (141 gal).

The Fomblin oil recovery process consists of oil collection, uranium precipitation, trace hydrocarbon removal, oil sampling, and storage of cleaned oil for reuse. Each step is performed manually.

Fomblin oil is collected in the Vacuum Pump Rebuild Workshop as part of the pump disassembly process. The oil is then transferred for processing to the Decontamination Workshop in plastic containers. The containers are labeled so each can be tracked through the process. Used oil awaiting processing is stored in the used oil storage receipt array to eliminate the possibility of accidental criticality.

Uranium compounds are removed from the Fomblin oil in the Fomblin oil fume hood to minimize personnel exposure to airborne contamination. Dissolved uranium compounds are removed by the addition of anhydrous sodium carbonate (Na_2CO_3) to the oil container which causes the uranium compounds to precipitate into sodium uranyl carbonate $Na_4UO_2(CO_3)_3$. The mixture is agitated and then filtered through a coarse screen to remove metal particles and small parts such as screws and nuts. These are transferred to the Solid Waste Collection System. The oil is then heated to $90^\circ C$ ($194^\circ F$) and stirred for 90 minutes to speed the reaction. The oil is then centrifuged to remove UF_4 , sodium uranyl carbonate, and various metallic fluorides. The particulate removed from the oil is collected and transferred to the Solid Waste Collection Room for disposal.

Trace amounts of hydrocarbons are next removed in the Fomblin oil fume hood next by adding activated carbon to the Fomblin oil and heating the mixture at $100^\circ C$ ($212^\circ F$) for two hours. The activated carbon absorbs the hydrocarbons, and the carbon in turn is removed by filtration through a bed celite. The resulting sludge is transferred to the Solid Waste Disposal Collection Room for disposal.

Recovered Fomblin oil is sampled. Oil that meets the criteria can be reused in the system while oil that does not meet the criteria will be reprocessed. The following limits have been set for evaluating recovered Fomblin oil purity for reuse in the plant:

- Uranium - 50 ppm by volume
- Hydrocarbons - 3 ppm by volume

Recovered Fomblin oil is stored in plastic containers in the Chemical Storage Area.

Failure of this system will not endanger the health and safety of the public. Nevertheless, design and operating features are included that contribute to the safety of plant workers. Containment of waste is provided by components, designated containers, and air filtration systems. Criticality is precluded through the control of geometry, mass, and the selection of appropriate storage containers. To minimize worker exposure, airborne radiological contamination resulting from dismantling is extracted. Where necessary, air suits and portable ventilation units are available for further worker protection.

4.13.4.2.2 Decontamination System

The Contaminated Workshop and Decontamination System are located in the same room in the TSB. This room is called the Decontamination Workshop. The Decontamination Workshop in the TSB will contain the area to break down and strip contaminated equipment and to decontaminate that equipment and its components. The decontamination systems in the workshop are designed to remove radioactive contamination from contaminated materials and equipment. The only significant forms of radioactive contamination found in the plant are uranium hexafluoride (UF_6), uranium tetrafluoride (UF_4) and uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2).

One of the functions of the Decontamination Workshop is to provide a maintenance facility for both UF_6 pumps and vacuum pumps. The workshop will be used for the temporary storage and subsequent dismantling of failed pumps. The dismantling area will be in physical proximity to the decontamination train, in which the dismantled pump components will be processed. Full maintenance records for each pump will be kept.

The process carried out within the Decontamination Workshop begins with receipt and storage of contaminated pumps, out-gassing, Fomblin oil removal and storage, and pump stripping. Activities for the dismantling and maintenance of other plant components are also carried out. Other components commonly decontaminated besides pumps include valves, piping, instruments, sample bottles, tools, and scrap metal. Personnel entry into the facility will be via a sub-change facility. This area has the required contamination controls, washing and monitoring facilities.

The decontamination part of the process consists of a series of steps following equipment disassembly including degreasing, decontamination, drying, and inspection. Items from uranium hexafluoride systems, waste handling systems, and miscellaneous other items are decontaminated in this system. The decontamination process for most plant components is described below, with a typical cycle time of one hour. For smaller components the decontamination process time is slightly less, about 50 minutes. Sample bottles and flexible hoses are handled under special procedures due to the difficulty of handling the specific shapes. Sample bottle decontamination and decontamination of flexible hoses are addressed separately below.

Criticality is precluded through the control of geometry, mass, and the selection of appropriate storage containers. Administrative measures are applied to uranium concentrations in the Citric Acid Tank and Degreaser Tank to maintain these controls. To minimize worker exposure, airborne radiological contamination resulting from dismantling is extracted. Air suits and portable ventilation units are available for further worker protection.

Containment of chemicals and wastes is provided by components, designated containers, and air filtration systems. All pipe work and vessels in the Decontamination Workshop are provided with design measures to protect against spillage or leakage. Hazardous wastes and materials are contained in tanks and other appropriate containers, and are strictly controlled by administrative procedures. Chemical reaction accidents are prevented by strict control on chemical handling.

4.13.4.2.3 General Decontamination

Prior to removal from the plant, the pump goes through an isolation and de-gas process. This removes the majority of UF_6 from the pump. The pump flanges are then sealed prior to movement to the Decontamination Workshop. The pumps are labeled so each can be tracked through the process. Pumps enter the Decontamination Workshop through airlock doors. The internal and external doors are electrically interlocked such that only one door can be opened at a given time. Pumps may enter the workshop individually or in pairs. Valves, pipework, flexible hoses, and general plant components are accepted into the room either within plastic bags or with the ends blinded.

Pumps waiting to be processed are stored in the pump storage array to eliminate the possibility of accidental criticality. The array maintains a minimum edge spacing of 600 mm (2 ft). Pumps are not accepted if there are no vacancies in the array.

Before being broken down and stripped, all pumps are placed in the Outgas Area and the local ventilation hose is positioned close to the pump flange. The flange cover is then removed. HF and UF_6 fumes from the pump are extracted via the exhaust hose, typically over a period of several hours. While in the Outgas Area, the oil will be drained from the pumps and the first stage roots pumps will be separated from the second stage roots pumps. The oil is drained into 5-L (1.3 gal) plastic containers that are labeled so each can be tracked through the process.

Prior to transfer from the Outgas Area, the outside of the bins, the pump frames, and the oil bottles are all monitored for radiological contamination. The various items will then be taken to the decontamination system or Fomblin oil storage array as appropriate.

Oil waiting to be processed is stored in the Fomblin oil storage array to eliminate the possibility of accidental criticality. The array maintains a minimum edge spacing of about 600 mm (2 ft) between containers. When ready for processing, the oil is transferred to the Fomblin Oil Recovery System where the uranics and hydrocarbon contaminants can be separated prior to reuse of the oil.

After out-gassing, individual pumps are removed from the Outgas Area and placed on either of the two hydraulic stripping tables. An overhead crane is utilized to aid the movement of pumps and tools over the stripping table. The tables can be height-adjusted and the pump can be moved and positioned on the table. Hydraulic stripping tools are then placed on the stripping tables using the overhead crane or mobile jig truck. The pump and motor are stripped to component level using various hydraulic and hand tools. Using the overhead crane or mobile jig truck, the components are placed in bins ready for transportation to the General Decontamination Cabinet.

Degreasing is performed following disassembly of equipment. Degreasing takes place in the hot water Degreaser Tank of the decontamination facility system. The degreased components are inspected and then transferred to the next decontamination tank.

Following disassembly and degreasing, decontamination is accomplished by immersing the contaminated component in a citric acid bath with ultrasonic agitation. After 15 minutes, the component is removed, and is rinsed with water to remove the citric acid.

The tanks are sampled periodically to determine the condition of the solution and any sludge present. The Citric Acid Tank contents are analyzed for uranium concentration and citric acid concentration. A limit on ^{235}U of 0.2 g/L (0.02 ounces/gal) of bath has been established to prevent criticality. Additional citric acid is added as necessary to keep the citric acid concentration between 5% and 7%. Spent solutions, consisting of citric acid and various uranyl and metallic citrates, are transferred to a citric acid collection tank. The Rinse Water Tanks are checked for satisfactory pH levels; unusable water is transferred to an effluent collection tank.

All components are dried after decontamination. This is performed manually using compressed air.

The decontaminated components are inspected prior to release. The quantity of contamination remaining shall be "as-low-as-reasonably practicable." Components released for unrestricted use do not have contamination exceeding 83.3 Bq/100 cm² (5,000 dpm/100 cm²) for average fixed alpha or beta/gamma contamination and 16 Bq/100 cm² (1,000 dpm/100 cm²) removable alpha or beta/gamma contamination. However, if all the component surfaces cannot be monitored then the consignment will be disposed of as a low-level waste.

4.13.4.2.4 Sample Bottle Decontamination

Sample bottle decontamination is handled somewhat differently than the general decontamination process. The Decontamination Workshop has a separate area dedicated to sample bottle storage, disassembly, and decontamination. Used sample bottles are weighed to confirm the bottles are empty. The valves are loosened, and the remainder of the decontamination process is performed in the sample bottle decontamination hood. The valves are removed inside the fume hood. Any loose material inside the bottle or valve is dissolved in a citric acid solution. Spent citric acid is transferred to the Spent Citric Acid Collection Tank in the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System.

Initially, sample bottles and valves are flushed with a 10% citric acid solution and then rinsed with deionized water. In the case of sample bottles, these are filled with deionized water and left to stand for an hour, while the valves are grouped together and citric acid is recirculated in a closed loop for an hour. These used solutions are collected and taken to the Citric Acid Collection Tank in the General Decontamination Cabinet. Any liquid spillages / drips are soaked away with paper tissues that are disposed of in the Solid Waste Collection Room. Bottles and valves are then rinsed again with deionized water. This used solution is collected in a small plastic beaker, and then poured into the Citric Acid Tank in the decontamination train. Both the bottles and valves are dried manually, using compressed air, and inspected for contamination and rust. The extracted air exhausts to the Gaseous Effluent Vent System (GEVS) to ensure airborne contamination is controlled. The bottles are then put into an electric oven to ensure total dryness, and on removal are ready for reuse. The cleaned components are transferred to the clean workshop for reassembly and pressure and vacuum testing.

4.13.4.2.5 Flexible Hose Decontamination

The decontamination of flexible hoses is handled somewhat differently than the general process and has a separate area. The decontamination process is performed in a Flexible Hose Decontamination Cabinet. This decontamination cabinet is designed to process only one flexible hose at a time and is comprised of a supply of citric acid, deionized water and compressed air.

Initially, the flexible hose is flushed with a 10% citric acid solution at 60°C (140°F) and then rinsed with deionized water (also at 60°C) (140°F) in a closed loop recirculation system. The used solutions (citric acid and deionized water) are transferred into the contaminated Citric Acid Tank for disposal. Interlocks are provided in the recirculation loop to prevent such that the recirculation pumps from starting if the flexible hose has not been connected correctly at both ends. Both the citric acid and deionized water recirculation pumps are equipped with a 15-minute timer device. The extracted air exhausts to the Gaseous Effluent Vent System (GEVS) to ensure airborne contamination is controlled. Spill from the drip tray are routed to either the Citric Acid Tank or the hot water recirculation tank, depending upon the decontamination cycle. Each flexible hose is then dried in the decontamination cupboard using hot compressed air at 60°C (140°F) to ensure complete dryness. The cleaned dry flexible hose is then transferred to the Vacuum Pump Rebuild Workshop for reassembly and pressure testing prior to reuse in the plant.

4.13.4.2.6 Decontamination Equipment

The following major components are included in the Decontamination System:

- **Citric Acid Baths:** An open top Citric Acid Tank with a sloping bottom in hastelloy is provided for the primary means of removing radioactive contamination. The sloping-bottom construction is provided for ease of emptying and draining the tank completely. The tank has a liquid capacity of 800 L (211 gal). The tank is located in a cabinet and is furnished with ultrasonic agitation, a thermostatically controlled electric heater to maintain the content's temperature at 60°C (140°F), and a recirculation pump. Mixing is provided to accommodate sampling for criticality prevention. Level control with a local alarm is provided to maintain the acid level. The tank has a ring header and a manual hose to rinse out residual solids/sludge with deionized water after the batch has been pumped to the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System. In order to minimize uranium concentration, the rinse water from the Rinse Water Tank that receives deionized water directly is pumped into the other Rinse Water Tank, which in turn is pumped into the Citric Acid Tank. The counter-current system eliminates a waste product stream by concentrating the uranics only in the Citric Acid Tank. The rinse water transfer pump is linked with the level controller of the Citric Acid Tank, which prevents overfilling of this tank during transfer of the rinse water. During transfer, the rinse water transfer pump trips at a high tank level resulting in a local alarm. The extracted air exhausts to the Gaseous Effluent Vent System (GEVS) to assure airborne contamination is controlled. The Citric Acid Tank contents are monitored and then emptied by an air-driven double diaphragm pump into the Spent Citric Acid Collection Tank in the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System.
- **Rinse Water Baths:** Two open top Rinse Water Tanks with stainless steel sloping bottoms are provided to rinse excess citric acid from decontaminated components. Each of the tanks has a liquid capacity of 800 L (211 gal). Both tanks are located in an enclosure, and

each tank is furnished with ultrasonic agitation, a thermostatically controlled electric heater to maintain the contents temperature at 60°C (140°F), and a recirculation pump to accommodate sampling for criticality prevention. The sloping-bottom is provided of emptying and draining the tank completely. Fresh deionized water is added to the tank. In order to minimize uranium concentration, the rinse water from the tank that receives deionized water directly is pumped into the other Rinse Water Tank, which in turn is pumped into the Citric Acid Tank. Level control is provided to maintain the deionized (rinse) water level. During transfer, the rinse water transfer pump trips at tank high level resulting in a local alarm. The Rinse Water Tank that directly receives deionized water is topped up manually with the water as necessary. The extracted air exhausts to the GEVS to assure airborne contamination is controlled. A manual spray hose is available for rinsing the tank after it has been emptied.

- **Decontamination Degreasing Unit:** An open top Degreaser Tank with a sloping bottom in hastelloy is provided for the primary means of removing the Fomblin oil and greases that may inhibit the decontamination process. Components requiring degreasing are cleaned manually and then immersed into the Degreaser Tank. The sloping-bottom construction is provided for ease of emptying and draining the tank completely. During the decontamination process, the tank contents are continuously recirculated using a pump. Recirculation is provided to accommodate sampling for criticality prevention. The tank has a capacity of 800 L (211 gal) and is located in a cabinet. It is furnished with an ultrasonic agitation facility, and a thermostatically-controlled electric heater to maintain the temperature at 60°C (140°F). The tank has a ring header and a manual hose to rinse out residual solids/sludge with deionized water after the batch has been pumped to the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System. The extracted air exhausts to the Gaseous Effluent Vent System (GEVS) to ensure airborne contamination is controlled. Level control with a local alarm is provided to maintain the liquid level. The Degreaser Tank contents are monitored and then emptied by an air-driven double diaphragm pump into the Degreaser Water Collection Tank in the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System.
- The activities carried out in the Decontamination Workshop may create potentially contaminated gaseous streams, which would require treatment before discharging to the atmosphere. These streams consist of air with traces of UF₆, HF, and uranium particulates (mainly UO₂F₂). The Gaseous Effluent Vent System is designed to route these streams to a filter system and to monitor, on a continuous basis, the resultant exhaust stream discharged to the atmosphere. Air exhausted from the General Decontamination Cabinet, the Sample Bottle Decontamination Cabinet, and the Flexible Hose Decontamination Cabinet is vented to the GEVS. There will be local ventilation ports in the stripping area and Outgas Area that operate under vacuum with all air discharging through the GEVS. The room itself will have other HVAC ventilation.
- Vapor Recovery Unit and distillation still.
- Drying Cabinet: One drying cabinet is provided to dry components after decontamination.
- Decontamination System for Sample Bottles (in a cabinet) - a small, fresh citric acid tank; a small, deionized water tank; and 5 L (1.3 gal) containers for citric acid/uranic waste
- Decontamination System for Flexible Hoses (in a cabinet) - a small citric acid tank for fresh and waste citric acid, an air diaphragm pump and associated equipment
- Various tools for moving equipment (e.g., cranes)

- Various tools for stripping equipment
- An integral monorail hoist with a lifting capacity of one ton, located within the decontamination enclosure, is provided to lift the basket and its components into and out of the Degreaser Tank, Citric Acid Tank, and the two Rinse Water Tanks as part of the decontamination activity sequence.
- Citric Acid Tank and Degreaser Tank clean-up ancillary items, comprised for each tank, a portable air driven transfer pump and associated equipment
- Radiation monitors.

4.13.4.2.7 Laundry System

The Laundry System cleans contaminated and soiled clothing and other articles which have been used throughout the plant. It contains the resulting solid and liquid wastes for transfer to appropriate treatment and disposal facilities. The Laundry System receives the clothing and articles from the plant in plastic bin bags, taken from containers strategically positioned within the plant. Clean clothing and articles are delivered to storage areas located within the plant. The Contaminated Laundry System components are located in the Laundry room of the TSB.

The Laundry System collects, sorts, cleans, dries, and inspects clothing and articles used throughout the plant in the various Restricted Areas. The laundry system does not handle any articles from outside the radiological zones. Laundry collection is divided into two main groups: articles with a low probability of contamination and articles with a high probability of contamination. Those articles unlikely to have been contaminated are further sorted into lightly soiled and heavily soiled groups. The sorting is done on a table underneath a vent hood that is connected to the TSB Gaseous Effluent Vent System (GEVS). All lightly soiled articles are cleaned in the laundry. Heavily soiled articles are inspected and any considered to be difficult to clean (i.e., those with significant amounts of grease or oil on them) are transferred to the Solid Waste Collection Room without cleaning. Special containers and procedures are used for collection, storage, and transfer of these items as described in the Solid Waste Disposal System section. Articles from one plant department are not cleaned with articles from another plant department.

Special water-absorbent bags are used to collect the articles that are more likely to be contaminated. These articles may include pressure suits and items worn when, for example, it is required to disconnect or "open up" an existing plant system. These articles that are more likely to be contaminated are cleaned separately. Expected contaminants on the laundry include slight amounts of uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2) and uranium tetrafluoride (UF_4).

Clothing processed by this system normally includes overalls, laboratory coats, shirts, towels and miscellaneous items. Approximately 113 kg (248 lbs) of clothing is washed each day. Upon completion of a cycle, the washer discharges to one of three Laundry Effluent Monitor Tanks in the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System.

The washed laundry is dried in the hot air dryers. The exhaust air passes through a lint drawer to the atmosphere. Upon completion of a drying cycle, the dried laundry is inspected for excessive wear. Usable laundry is folded and returned to storage for reuse. Unusable laundry is handled as solid waste as described in the Solid Waste Disposal System section.

When sorting is completed, the articles are placed into the front-loading washing machine in batches. The cleaning process uses 80°C (176°F) minimum water, detergents, and non-chlorine bleach for dirt and odor removal, and disinfection of the laundry. Detergents and non-chlorine bleach are added by vendor-supplied automatic dispensing systems. No "dry cleaning" solvents are used. Wastewater from the washing machine is discharged to one of three Laundry Effluent Monitor Tanks in the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System. The laundry effluent is then sampled, analyzed, and transferred to the double-lined Treated Effluent Evaporative Basin with leak detection for disposal (if uncontaminated) or to the Precipitation Treatment Tank for treatment as necessary.

When the washing cycle is complete, the wet laundry is placed in a front-loading, electrically heated dryer. The dryer has variable temperature settings, and the hot wet air is exhausted to the atmosphere through a lint drawer that is built into the dryer. The lint from the drawer is then sent to the Solid Waste Disposal System as combustible waste.

Dry laundry is removed from the dryer and placed on the laundry inspection table for inspection and folding. Folded laundry is returned to storage areas in the plant.

The following major components are included in this system:

- **Washers:** Two industrial quality washing machines are provided to clean contaminated and soiled laundry. One machine is operating and one is a spare for standby. Each machine has an equal capacity that is capable of washing the daily batches.
- **Dryers:** Two industrial quality dryers are provided to dry the laundry cleaned in the washing machine. One dryer is operating and one is a spare for standby. Each machine has an equal capacity that is capable of drying the daily batches. The dryer has a lint drawer that filters out the majority of the lint.
- **Air Hood:** One exhaust hood mounted over the sorting table and connected to the TSB GEVS. The hood is to draw potentially contaminated air away as laundry is sorted prior to washing.
- **Sorting Table:** One table to sort laundry prior to washing.
- **Laundry Inspection Table:** One table to inspect laundry for excessive wear after washing and drying.

The Laundry System interfaces with the following other plant systems:

- **Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System:** The wastewater generated during the laundry process is pumped to one of three Laundry Effluent Monitor Tanks.
- **Solid Waste Disposal System:** The Solid Waste Disposal System receives clothing that has been laundered but is not acceptable for further use. It also receives clothing rejected from the laundry system due to excess quantities of oil or hazardous liquids.
- **TSB GEVS:** Air from the sorting hood is sent to the TSB GEVS.
- **Process Water System:** The Process Water System supplies hot and cold water to the washer.
- **Compressed Air System:** Compressed air will be supplied as required to support options selected for the Laundry washers and dryers.
- **Electrical System:** The washing machines and dryers consume power.

Piping, piping components, and a laundry room sump provide containment of any liquid radiological waste. Small leaks and spills from the washer are mopped up and sent to the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System. A rarely occurring large leak is captured in the laundry room sump. Any effluent captured in the sump is transferred to the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System by a portable pump.

Liquid effluents from the washers are collected in the Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System and monitored prior to discharge to the Treated Effluent Evaporative Basin. Clothing containing hazardous wastes is segregated prior to washing to avoid introduction into this system. The exhaust air blows to atmosphere because there is little chance of any contaminant being in it.

The washer and dryer are equipped with electronic controls to monitor the operation. The dryer has a fire protection system that initiates an isolated sprinkler inside the dryer basket if a fire is detected in the dryer.

4.13.5 Comparative Waste Management Impacts of No Action Alternative Scenarios

ER Chapter 2, Alternatives, provides a discussion of possible alternatives to the construction and operation of the NEF, including an alternative of "no action" i.e., not building the NEF. The following information provides comparative conclusions specific to the concerns addressed in this subsection for each of the three "no action," alternative scenarios addressed in ER Section 2.4, Table 2.4-2, Comparison of Environmental Impacts for the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative Scenarios.

Alternative Scenario B – No NEF; USEC deploys a centrifuge plant and continues to operate the Paducah gaseous diffusion plant (GDP): The waste management impact would be greater since a greater amount of waste results from GDP operation.

Alternative Scenario C – No NEF; USEC deploys a centrifuge plant and increases the centrifuge plant capability: The waste management impact would be greater in the short term because the GDP produces a larger waste stream. In the long term, the waste management impact would be the same once the GDP production is terminated.

Alternative Scenario D – No NEF; USEC does not deploy a centrifuge plant and operates the Paducah GDP at an increased capacity: The waste management impact would be significantly greater because a significant amount of additional waste results from GDP operation at the increased capacity.

TABLES

(This page Intentionally left blank)

Table 4.13-1 Possible Radioactive Waste Processing / Disposal Facilities

Page 1 of 1

Radioactive Waste Processing / Disposal Facility	Acceptable Wastes	Approximate Distance km (miles)
Barnwell Disposal Site Barnwell, SC	Radioactive Class A, B, C Processed Mixed	2,320 (1,441)
Envirocare of Utah South Clive, UT	Radioactive Class A Mixed	1,636 (1016)
GTS Duratek ¹ Oak Ridge, TN	Radioactive Class A Some Mixed	1,993 (1,238)
Depleted UF ₆ Conversion Facility ² Paducah, Kentucky	Depleted UF ₆	1,670 (1037)
Depleted UF ₆ Conversion Facility ² Portsmouth, Ohio	Depleted UF ₆	2,243 (1,393)

¹Other offsite waste processors may also be used.

²Per DOE-UDS contract, to begin operation in 2005.

Table 4.13-2 LLNL-Estimated Life-Cycle Costs for DOE Depleted UF₆ to Depleted U₃O₈ Conversion

Page 1 of 1

LLNL-ESTIMATED LIFE-CYCLE COSTS FOR DOE DEPLETED UF ₆ TO DEPLETED U ₃ O ₈ CONVERSION (A) (MILLION DOLLARS FOR 378,600 MTU OF DEPLETED UF ₆ OVER 20 YEARS; DISCOUNTED 1996 DOLLARS)		
Conversion Capital & Operating Activities	AHF Conversion Alternative	HF Neutralization Conversion Alternative
Technology Department	9.84	5.74
Process Equipment	22.36	20.88
Process Facilities	46.33	45.53
Balance of Plant	29.20	30.25
Regulatory Compliance	22.70	22.70
Operations & Maintenance	134.76	198.40
Decontamination & Decommissioning	1.76	1.73
Total Discounted Costs (1996 Dollars):	266.95	325.23
Total Undiscounted Costs (1996 Dollars):	902.6	1,160.1
Undiscounted Unit Costs (\$/kgU):		
TOTAL (1996 Dollars)	2.38	3.05
TOTAL (2002 Dollars per GDP IPD)	2.64	3.39
(a) Source: (LLNL, 1997a)		
AHF: Assumes sale of anhydrous hydrogen fluoride; \$77.32 million credit assumed.		
HF: Assumes sale of calcium fluoride (CAF ₂) produced from hydrogen fluoride (HF); \$11.02 million credit assumed.		

Table 4.13-3 Summary of LLNL-Estimated Capital, Operating and Regulatory Unit Costs for DOE Depleted UF₆ to Depleted U₃O₈ Conversion

Page 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF LLNL-ESTIMATED CAPITAL, OPERATING, AND REGULATORY UNIT COSTS FOR DOE DEPLETED UF ₆ TO DEPLETED U ₃ O ₈ CONVERSION (A) (UNDISCOUNTED DOLLARS PER KILOGRAMS OF U AS DEPLETED UF ₆)				
Cost Breakdown	AHF Alternative		HF Neutralization Alternative	
	1996\$	2002\$	1996\$	2002\$
Capital (b)	0.72	0.80	0.69	0.76
Operating & Maintenance	1.51	1.67	2.22	2.46
Regulatory Compliance	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.16
Total:	2.38	2.64	3.05	3.39
(a) Unit costs based on Table 4.13-2 costs.				
(b) Technology development, process equipment, process facilities, balance of plant and decontamination and decommissioning.				
Source: (LLNL, 1997a)				
Note: Summation may be affected by rounding.				

Table 4.13-4 LLNL-Estimated Life-Cycle Costs for DOE Depleted UF₆ Disposal Alternatives
Page 1 of 1

LLNL-ESTIMATED LIFE-CYCLE COSTS FOR DOE DEPLETED U ₃ O ₈ DISPOSAL ALTERNATIVES (MILLION DOLLARS FOR 378,600 MTU OF DEPLETED UF ₆ OVER 20 YEARS; UNDISCOUNTED 1996 DOLLARS)		
	Depleted U ₃ O ₈ Disposal Alternatives	
Depleted U ₃ O ₈ Disposal Capital & Operating Activities	Engineered Trench	Concrete Vault
Waste Form Preparation:		
Technology Development	6.56	6.56
Balance of Plant	26.43	26.43
Regulatory Compliance	2.02	2.02
Operations & Maintenance	33.23	33.23
Decontamination & Decommissioning	0.60	0.60
Subtotal (1996 Discounted Dollars)	68.84	68.84
Waste Disposal:		
Facility Engineering & Construction	12.22	96.08
Site Preparation & Restoration	0.89	1.68
Emplacement & Closure	30.61	39.2
Regulatory Compliance	40.35	40.35
Surveillance & Maintenance	2.29	2.86
Subtotal (1996 Discounted Dollars)	86.36	180.17
Preparation & Disposal Discounted Total Costs (1996 Dollars):	155.20	249.01
Preparation & Disposal Undiscounted Total Costs (1996 Dollars):	499.60	742.50
Undiscounted Unit Costs (\$/kgU):		
TOTAL (1996 Dollars)	1.31	1.95
TOTAL (2002 Dollars per GDP IPD)	1.46	2.17
Source: (LLNL, 1997a)		

Table 4.13-5 Summary of Total Estimated Conversion and Disposal Costs
Page 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF TOTAL ESTIMATED CONVERSION AND DISPOSAL COSTS (UNDISCOUNTED 2002 DOLLARS PER KGU OF DEPLETED UF ₆)				
Cost Items	AHF Alternative		HF Neutralization Alternative	
	Engineered Trench	Concrete Vault	Engineered Trench	Concrete Vault
Depleted UF ₆ Conversion to Depleted U ₃ O ₈	2.64	2.64	3.39	3.39
Waste Preparation & Disposal	1.46	2.17	1.46	2.17
Depleted UF ₆ & Depleted U ₃ O ₈ Transportation	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Total Cost:	4.35	5.06	5.1	5.81

Table 4.13-6

DOE-UDS August 29, 2002 Contract Quantities and Costs

Page 1 of 1

DOE-UDS AUGUST 29, 2002, CONTRACT QUANTITIES & COSTS		
	Target Million kgU	
UDS Conversion & Disposal Quantities:	Depleted UF ₆ (a)	U (b)
FY 2005 (Aug. – Sept.)	1.050	0.710
FY 2006	27.825	18.8
FY 2007	31.500	21.294
FY 2008	31.500	21.294
FY 2009	31.500	21.294
FY 2010 (Oct.-July)	26.250	17.745
Total:	149.625	101.147
Nominal Conversion Capacity (c) and Target Conversion Rate (Million kgU/yr)		21.3
UDS Contract Workscope Costs (d):	Million \$	
Design, Permitting, Project Management, etc.	27.99	
Construct Paducah Conversion Facility	93.96	
Construct Portsmouth Conversion Facility	90.40	
Operations for First 5 Years Depleted UF ₆ & Depleted U ₃ O ₈ (e)	283.23	
Contract Estimated Total Cost w/o Fee	495.58	
Contract Estimated Value per DOE PR, August 29, 2003	558.00	
Difference Between Cost & Value is the Estimated Fee of 12.6%	62.42	
Capital Cost without Fee	212.35	
Capital Cost with Fee	239.10	
First 5 Years Operating Cost with Fee	318.92	
Estimated Unit Conversion & Disposal Costs:		
Unit Capital Cost (f)	\$0.77/kgU	
2005-2010 Unit Operating Costs in 2002\$	\$3.15/kgU	
Total Estimated Unit Cost	\$3.92kgU	
(a) As on page B-10 of the UDS contract.		
(b) Depleted UF ₆ weight multiplied by the uranium atomic mass fraction, 0.676.		
(c) Based on page H-34 of the UDS contract.		
(d) Workscope costs on an UDS contract pages B-2 and B-3.		
(e) Does not include any potential off-set credit for HF sales.		
(f) Assumed operation over 25 years, 6% government cost of money, and no taxes.		

Table 4.13-7 Summary of Depleted UF₆ Disposal Costs From Four Sources
Page 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF Depleted UF ₆ DISPOSAL COSTS FROM FOUR SOURCES				
Source	Costs in 2002 Dollars per kgU			
	Conversion	Disposal	Transportation	Total
LLNL (UCRL-AR-127650 (a))	2.64	2.17	0.25	5.06
UDS Contract (b)	(d)	(d)	(d)	3.92
URENCO (e)	(d)	(d)	(d)	(d)
CEC Cost Estimate (c)	4.93	1.47	0.34	6.74
<p>(a) 1997 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory cost estimate study for DOE; discounted costs in 1996 dollars were undiscounted and escalated to 2002 by ERI.</p> <p>(b) Uranium Disposition Services (UDS) contract with DOE for capital and operating costs for first five years of Depleted UF₆ conversion and Depleted U₃O₈ conversion product disposition.</p> <p>(c) Based upon depleted UF₆ and depleted U₃O₈ disposition costs provided to the NRC during Clalborne Energy Center license application in 1993.</p> <p>(d) Cost component proprietary or not made available.</p> <p>(e) The average of the three costs is \$5.24/kg U. LES has selected \$5.50/kgU as the disposal cost for the National Enrichment Facility. Urenco has reviewed this cost estimate, and based on its current experience with UF₆ disposal, finds this figure to be prudent.</p>				